

Remarks

Claims 1-30 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 16, and 17 are rejected. Claims 4, 6, 13-14, 19, 21 and 28-29 already have been confirmed as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 5, 7-12, 15, 18, 20, 22-27 and 30 have been cancelled by a previously performed amended. Claims 1, 4, and 16 have been amended.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Official Letter reads in paragraph 6 at page 10 of the Official Letter: "Claims 4, 6, 13-14, 19, 21 and 28-29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The prior art of record teaches adjusting a plasma display to compensate for load effect but fails to specifically teach (1) adjusting based on maximal load difference of a current frame and a plurality of preceding frames (Claims 4 and 19); (2) measuring and adjusting in accordance with first and second average power levels (Claims 6 and 21); (3) rescaling the number of sustain pulses to redistribute sustain pulses proportional to the second number of sustain pulses (Claims 13 and 28); and (4) rescaling the number of sustain pulses in order of average power level needed (Claims 14 and 29) (enumeration added)." Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter.

Claim Amendments

Independent claims 1 and 16 have been amended by incorporation the allowable subject matter of claim 4. In view of the amendments and discussion above, the subject matter of independent claims 1 and 16 is allowable and since the remainder of the pending claims depend from either claim 1 or claim 16, they are also

allowable. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw of the rejection to the claims and pass the claims to issue.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 16 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuriyama et al. (U.S. Pat No. 6, 100,859).

This rejection is rendered moot in view of the amendments to the claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the amended pending claims patentably define over the cited art and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of the pending claims. Reconsideration for a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

If any additional fees are incurred on the basis of this amendment, please charge such fee against deposit account 07-0832

Respectfully submitted,  
Sébastien Weitbruch  
Cédric Thebault  
Carlos Correa



James McKenzie  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 51,146  
(609) 734-6866

THOMSON Licensing LLC  
Patent Operation  
PO Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: 1/24/11